

Fiscal Note 2011 Biennium

Bill #	НВ0663		Title: Generally	revise taxes and mitigate re	eappraisal
Primary Sponsor	Jopek, Mike		Status: As Introd	uced	
✓ Significan	nt Local Gov Impact	☐ Needs to be include	ed in HB 2	Technical Concerns	
☐ Included	in the Executive Budget	☐ Significant Long-Ten	rm Impacts	Dedicated Revenue Form	Attached
		FISCAL S	UMMARY		
		FY 2010 Difference	FY 2011 Difference	FY 2012 Difference	FY 2013 Difference
Expenditures:		Difference	<u>Differ ence</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Difference</u>
General Fund		\$1,205,898	\$6,447,571	\$5,353,176	\$5,679,257
Revenue:					
General Fund		(\$11,952,076)	(\$27,421,970)	(\$43,067,218)	(\$59,394,576)
State Special	Revenue	(\$634,914)	(\$1,587,045)	(\$2,553,904)	(\$3,621,331
Net Impact-Ge	neral Fund Balance:	(\$13,157,974)	(\$33,869,541)	(\$48,420,394)	(\$65,073,833)

Description of fiscal impact: HB 663 increases the income eligibility limits for the elderly homeowner-renter tax credit and the extended property tax assistance program, phases-in reappraisal values over a six year period, steps up the homestead exemption from 35.9% to 42%, steps up the comstead exemption from 15.3% to 16.6%.

Note that this fiscal note is written from current law and not from HJR2. In all most all fiscal notes, current law and HJR2 are the same. In the case of property tax for this biennium, the Legislature intentionally reduced the estimates in HJR 2 for the mitigation anticipated during this legislative session. The impacts of this legislation relative to HJR 2 are shown on page 8. Please use page 8 for purposes of comparing to HJR 2 or the general fund status

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Assumptions:

Department of Revenue

Property Valuation and Taxes

1. Under current law, the increase in reappraisal value for class 3 agricultural land, class 4 residential and commercial real property and class 10 forestland is phased in over six years. For each year over the six

- years, the homestead exemption for class 4 residential real properties would remain at 34% and the comstead exemption for class 4 commercial real properties would remain at 15%. The tax rate for classes 3 and 4 would be 3.01% and the tax rate for class 10 would be 0.35%.
- 2. Section 1 of HB 663 sets the class 3 agricultural land tax rate, class 4 residential and commercial property exemption and tax rates. Class 3 agricultural land has the same tax rates as class 4 residential property. Section 2 of HB 663 sets the class 10 tax rate.

	Class 3	Class		ss 4		Class 10
	Agricultural Property	Resider	<u>ntial Property</u>	Commercial Property		Forestland
Tax	Tax	Tax	Exemption	Exemption	Tax	Tax
Year	<u>Rate</u>	Rate	Percentage	Percentage	Rate	Rate
2009	2.85%	2.85%	35.90%	15.30%	3.01%	0.32%
2010	2.70%	2.70%	37.40%	15.50%	3.01%	0.30%
2011	2.57%	2.57%	38.70%	15.70%	3.01%	0.28%
2012	2.45%	2.45%	39.90%	15.90%	3.01%	0.26%
2013	2.35%	2.35%	41.10%	16.40%	3.01%	0.24%
2014	2.25%	2.25%	42.00%	16.60%	3.01%	0.23%

- 3. Under both current and proposed law, class 4 commercial multifamily dwellings would receive the homestead exemption but have the class 4 commercial tax rate applied to determine taxable value.
- 4. Section 5 of the bill establishes a six-year reappraisal cycle for class 3, class 4, and class 10 property.

Increase in Value Due to Reappraisal

5. Table 1 shows the estimated reappraisal increases in the values of class 4 qualified residential property, class 4 commercial multifamily property, class 4 other commercial property, and class 10 forestland.

	Table 1					
Changes in Value Due to Reappraisal						
Type of Property	2003 Reappraisal	Full Market Value - 2009 Reappraisal	Difference in Value	Percent Change		
Class 3 - Agricultural Land	\$4,446,329,036	\$5,636,120,313	\$1,189,791,277	26.8%		
Class 4 - Residential: Qualified Property	\$40,286,439,574	\$62,736,351,708	\$22,449,912,134	55.7%		
Class 4 - Residential: NonQualified Property	\$8,428,130,282	\$12,838,871,234	\$4,410,740,952	52.3%		
Subtotal Class 4 - Residential Property	\$48,714,569,856	\$75,575,222,942	\$26,860,653,086	55.1%		
Class 4 - Commercial: Multifamily Property	\$2,226,005,531	\$2,964,215,783	\$738,210,253	33.2%		
Class 4 - Commercial: All Other Property	\$11,464,532,592	\$15,444,499,573	\$3,979,966,981	34.7%		
Subtotal Class 4 Commercial	\$13,690,538,123	\$18,408,715,357	\$4,718,177,234	34.5%		
Class 4 Total	\$62,405,107,979	\$93,983,938,299	\$31,578,830,320	50.6%		
Class - 10 Forest Land	\$1,947,330,452	\$2,999,858,721	\$1,052,528,269	54.0%		

Class 3 Agricultural Land

6. Table 2 displays class 3 agricultural land property values under current law and proposed law for each year of this fiscal note.

		Table 2			
	Class 3 Agricultural La	and - Fiscal Impact o	of HB 663 Reapprais	al Mitigation	
	FY 2009 (HJ 2)	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
HB 663 (six -yea	ar phase-in)				
Market Value	\$4,446,329,036	\$4,669,932,815	\$4,868,231,361	\$5,066,529,907	\$5,281,326,329
Tax Rate	3.01%	2.85%	2.70%	2.57%	2.45%
(effective tax rate)	3.20%	3.03%	2.87%	2.73%	2.60%
Taxable Value	\$142,099,000	\$141,311,797	\$139,559,017	\$138,250,484	\$137,382,690
Current Law (six-	year phase-in)				
Market Value	\$4,446,329,036	\$4,644,627,582	\$4,842,926,128	\$5,057,021,865	\$5,300,285,091
Tax Rate	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%
(effective tax rate)	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%	3.20%
Taxable Value	\$142,099,000	\$148,436,368	\$154,773,737	\$161,615,963	\$169,390,345
	D	Difference (HB 658 - C	Current Law)		
Taxable Value	\$0	(\$7,124,571)	(\$15,214,720)	(\$23,365,479)	(\$32,007,656)
State Revenue					
State Mills (95.53 mills)	\$0	(\$680,610)	(\$1,453,462)	(\$2,232,104)	(\$3,057,691)
University Mills (6 mills)	\$0	(\$42,747)	(\$91,288)	(\$140,193)	(\$192,046)

Class 4 Residential Property Values

7. Table 2 displays Class 4 residential property values under current law and proposed law for each year of this fiscal note.

		Table 3			
Class 4 Resid	ential Real Property		HB 663 Reappraisa	al Mitigation	
	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
HB 663 (six year phase	e-in)				
Market Value	\$48,714,569,856	\$54,889,773,181	\$59,516,423,329	\$63,952,812,120	\$68,564,710,630
Homestead Rate	34.00%	35.90%	37.40%	38.70%	39.90%
Taxable Market Value	\$32,151,616,105	\$35,184,344,609	\$37,257,281,004	\$39,203,073,830	\$41,207,391,089
Tax Rate	3.01%	2.85%	2.70%	2.57%	2.45%
Taxable Value	\$967,763,645	\$1,002,753,821	\$1,005,946,587	\$1,007,518,997	\$1,009,581,082
Current Law (six-year p	hase-in)				
Market Value	\$48,714,569,856	\$55,053,008,613	\$61,613,365,387	\$68,166,272,860	\$74,925,046,142
Homestead Rate	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%
Taxable Market Value	\$32,151,616,105	\$36,334,985,685	\$40,664,821,155	\$44,989,740,087	\$49,450,530,453
Tax Rate	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%
Taxable Value	\$967,763,645	\$1,093,683,069	\$1,224,011,117	\$1,354,191,177	\$1,488,460,967
Difference (HB 663 - Current Law)					
Taxable Value	\$0	(\$90,929,248)	(\$218,064,530)	(\$346,672,179)	(\$478,879,885)
State Revenue					
State Mills (95.53 mills)	\$0	(\$8,686,471)	(\$20,831,705)	(\$33,117,593)	(\$45,747,395)
University Mills (6 mills)	\$0	(\$545,575)	(\$1,308,387)	(\$2,080,033)	(\$2,873,279)

Class 4 Commercial Multifamily Property

8. Table 3 displays Class 4 commercial multifamily property values under current law and proposed law for each year of this fiscal note.

		Table 4			
Class 4 (Commercia	al) Multifamily Reside	nces - Fiscal Impac	t of HB 663 Reappi	raisal Mitigation	
	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
HB 663 (six year phase	e-in)				
Market Value	\$2,226,005,531	\$2,426,950,766	\$2,554,292,035	\$2,670,756,171	\$2,797,556,085
Homestead Rate	34.00%	35.90%	37.40%	38.70%	39.90%
Taxable Market Value	\$1,469,163,650	\$1,555,675,441	\$1,598,986,814	\$1,637,173,533	\$1,681,331,207
Tax Rate (Commercial)	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%
Taxable Value	\$44,221,826	\$46,825,831	\$48,129,503	\$49,278,923	\$50,608,069
Current Law (six-year p	hase-in)				
Market Value	\$2,226,005,531	\$2,431,255,498	\$2,643,692,374	\$2,853,640,398	\$3,070,184,274
Homestead Rate	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%
Taxable Market Value	\$1,469,163,650	\$1,604,628,629	\$1,744,836,967	\$1,883,402,663	\$2,026,321,621
Tax Rate (Commercial)	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%
Taxable Value	\$44,221,826	\$48,299,322	\$52,519,593	\$56,690,420	\$60,992,281
	Difference	(HB 663 - Current I	Law)		
Taxable Value	\$0	(\$1,473,491)	(\$4,390,090)	(\$7,411,497)	(\$10,384,211)
State Revenue					
State Mills (95.53 mills)	\$0	(\$140,763)	(\$419,385)	(\$708,020)	(\$992,004)
University Mills (6 mills)	\$0	(\$8,841)	(\$26,341)	(\$44,469)	(\$62,305)

Class 4 Commercial Real Property

9. Table 6 displays Class 4 commercial property values under current law and proposed law for each year of this fiscal note.

		Table 5					
Class 4 Commercial Real Property - Fiscal Impact of HB 663 Reappraisal Mitigation							
	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013		
HB 663 (six year	phase-in)						
Market Value	\$11,464,532,592	\$12,529,119,063	\$13,215,663,368	\$13,845,926,443	\$14,529,552,105		
Comstead Rate	15.0%	15.3%	15.5%	15.9%	16.4%		
Taxable Market Value	\$9,744,852,704	\$10,612,163,847	\$11,167,235,546	\$11,644,424,139	\$12,146,705,560		
Tax Rate	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%		
Taxable Value	\$293,320,066	\$319,426,132	\$336,133,790	\$350,497,167	\$365,615,837		
Current Law (six-ye	ear phase-in)						
Market Value	\$11,464,532,592	\$12,127,860,423	\$12,791,188,253	\$13,454,516,083	\$14,117,843,913		
Comstead Rate	15%	15%	15%	15%	15.0%		
Taxable Market Value	\$9,744,852,704	\$10,308,681,359	\$10,872,510,015	\$11,436,338,670	\$12,000,167,326		
Tax Rate	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%	3.01%		
Taxable Value	\$293,320,066	\$322,294,302	\$358,384,589	\$396,427,593	\$436,510,504		
Difference (HB 663 - Current Law)							
Taxable Value	\$0	(\$2,868,171)	(\$22,250,799)	(\$45,930,427)	(\$70,894,666)		
State Revenue							
State Mills (95.53 mills)	\$0	(\$273,996)	(\$2,125,619)	(\$4,387,734)	(\$6,772,567)		
University Mills (6 mills)	\$0	(\$17,209)	(\$133,505)	(\$275,583)	(\$425,368)		

Class 10 Forestland

10. Table 6 displays Class 10 forestland property values under current law and proposed law for each year of this fiscal note.

		Table 6			
Class	10 Forestland - Fiscal l	Impact of HB 663	Reappraisal Mitig	gation	
	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
HB 663 (six year pl	nase-in)				
Market (Productivity) Value	\$1,947,330,452	\$2,122,751,830	\$2,298,173,208	\$2,491,750,155	\$2,668,557,362
Tax Rate	0.35%	0.32%	0.30%	0.28%	0.26%
Taxable Value	\$6,817,000	\$6,792,806	\$6,894,520	\$6,976,900	\$6,938,249
Current Law (six-year	r phase-in)				
Market (Productivity) Value	\$1,947,330,452	\$2,122,751,830	\$2,298,173,208	\$2,454,066,087	\$2,608,728,226
Tax Rate	0.35%	0.35%	0.35%	0.35%	0.35%
Taxable Value	\$6,817,000	\$7,429,631	\$8,043,606	\$8,589,231	\$9,130,549
	Difference ((HB 663 - Current	Law)		
Change in Taxable Value	\$0	(\$636,826)	(\$1,149,087)	(\$1,612,331)	(\$2,192,300)
State Revenue					
State Mills (95.53 mills)	\$0	(\$60,836)	(\$109,772)	(\$154,026)	(\$209,430)
University Mills (6 mills)	\$0	(\$3,821)	(\$6,895)	(\$9,674)	(\$13,154)

11. Table 7 displays the in taxable value of the reappraised property under current law and proposed law for each year of this fiscal note.

		Table7			
Summar	y of Change in Tax FY 2009	able Value and Pro FY 2010	operty Tax Revenue FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
HB 663 (six- year phase-in)		FT 2010	FT 2011	F 1 2012	F1 2013
Class 3 - Agricultural Land	\$142,099,000	\$141,311,797	\$139,559,017	\$138,250,484	\$137,382,690
Class 4 - Residential Property	\$967,763,645	\$1,002,753,821	\$1,005,946,587	\$1,007,518,997	\$1,009,581,082
Class 4 - Commercial: Multifamily Property	\$44,221,826	\$46,825,831	\$48,129,503	\$49,278,923	\$50,608,069
Class 4 - Commercial: All Other Property	\$293,320,066	\$319,426,132	\$336,133,790	\$350,497,167	\$365,615,837
Subtotal Class 4 Commercial	\$337,541,892	\$366,251,963	\$384,263,293	\$399,776,090	\$416,223,907
Class 4 Total	\$1,305,305,537	\$1,369,005,784	\$1,390,209,880	\$1,407,295,087	\$1,425,804,988
Class - 10 Forest Land	\$6,817,000	\$7,429,631	\$8,043,606	\$8,589,231	\$9,130,549
Total Taxable Value	\$1,454,221,537	\$1,517,747,213	\$1,537,812,503	\$1,554,134,803	\$1,572,318,227
Current Law (six-year phase	-in)				
Class 3 - Agricultural Land	\$142,099,000	\$148,436,368	\$154,773,737	\$161,615,963	\$169,390,345
Class 4 - Residential Property	\$967,763,645	\$1,093,683,069	\$1,224,011,117	\$1,354,191,177	\$1,488,460,967
Class 4 - Commercial: Multifamily Property	\$44,221,826	\$48,299,322	\$52,519,593	\$56,690,420	\$60,992,281
Class 4 - Commercial: All Other Property	\$293,320,066	\$322,294,302	\$358,384,589	\$396,427,593	\$436,510,504
Subtotal Class 4 Commercial	\$337,541,892	\$370,593,624	\$410,904,181	\$453,118,013	\$497,502,784
Class 4 Total	\$1,305,305,537	\$1,464,276,693	\$1,634,915,298	\$1,807,309,190	\$1,985,963,751
Class - 10 Forest Land	\$6,817,000	\$7,429,631	\$8,043,606	\$8,589,231	\$9,130,549
Total Taxable Value	\$1,454,221,537	\$1,620,142,693	\$1,797,732,641	\$1,977,514,384	\$2,164,484,645
	Difference (I	HB 663 - Current L	aw)		
Change in Taxable Value	\$0	(\$102,395,480)	(\$259,920,138)	(\$423,379,581)	(\$592,166,418)
State Revenue					
State Mills (95.53 mills)	\$0	(\$9,781,840)	(\$24,830,171)	(\$40,445,451)	(\$56,569,658)
University Mills (6 mills)	\$0	(\$614,373)	(\$1,559,521)	(\$2,540,277)	(\$3,552,999)

12. Section 3 of the bill amends the extended property assistance program (EPTAP) in 15-6-193 (5)(a), MCA, removing the reference to revaluation cycles after December 31, 2008. The bill also increases the income limitations from \$25,000-\$75,000 to \$28,500-\$85,500. It amends the eligibility for the increase in taxable value from 24% to 54%, and the tax dollar increase from \$250 to \$285 for the \$28,500 or less income. For income levels from \$28,500 to \$57,000 taxable value must increase 60% and taxes \$285, and for income levels from \$57,000 - \$85,500 taxable value must increase 60% and taxes \$285.

Current Law			НВ 6663			
	% Change in			% Change in		
Income Test	Taxable Value	Tax Liability	Income Test	Taxable Value	Tax Liability	
- Income is \$25,000 or less - Income is > \$25,000 but <	24%	\$250	- Income is \$28,000 or less	55%	\$285	
\$50,000 - Income is > \$50,000 but <	30%	\$250	- Income is > \$28,000 but < \$57,000	60%	\$285	
\$75,000	36%	\$250	- Income is > \$57,000 but < \$85,500	70%	\$285	

13. The amendments to (EPTAP) have the following estimated impact:

HB 663: Reduction in Taxable Value - Extended Property Tax Assistance						
	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013		
Taxable Value Reduction Revenue Reduction	\$3,423,535	\$4,587,359	\$2,271,231	\$1,388,614		
State Mills (95.53 mills) University Mills (6 mills)	\$325,236 \$20,541	\$435,799 \$27,524	\$215,767 \$13,627	\$131,918 \$8,332		

14. Sections 7 and 8 increase the income limits for eligibility for the elderly homeowner-renter credit and increase the amount of the credit for some taxpayers. Income tax and property tax records were matched for taxpayers who claimed the \$400 property tax rebate. Each 2008 property value was increased by the average percentage reappraisal increase in its levy district to give an estimated 2009 reappraisal value. Each taxpayer's income was grown using the income growth assumptions in the HJR2 income tax revenue estimate. Elderly homeowner-renter credits were calculated under current law and under this bill for eligible taxpayers, and the percentage difference in the total amount of credits was calculated. It is assumed that credits to eligible renters will increase by the same percentage. The following table shows the calculated percentage increase in credits from this bill for each tax year from 2009 through 2012 and the resulting increase in total credits:

	Additional Home	eowner-Renter
Tax	Credits	
Year	%	\$ million
2009	18.80%	\$1.845
2010	21.97%	\$2.156
2011	24.52%	\$2.406
2012	27.45%	\$2.693

15. Elderly homeowner-renter credits are claimed on tax returns and credit claim forms following the end of each tax year. The additional credit claims shown for tax years 2009 through 2012 will result in equal reductions in general fund revenue in FY 2010 through FY 2013.

Department Costs

Property Assessment Division

- 16. DOR's property assessment division would require 5 tax appraisers in FY 2010, 5 appraisers in FY 2011, 5 appraisers in FY 2012, and 5 appraisers in FY 2013 to handle the additional residential valuation requirements in a four-year time span as required by HB 663. The estimated expenditures associated with these positions are \$301,366 in FY 2010, \$278,216 in FY 2011, \$278,216 in FY 2012, and \$278,216 in FY 2013.
- 17. There would be an additional cost for self-reporting mailing of \$126,400 in FY 2010, \$129,451 in FY 2011, \$131,005 in FY 2012, and \$132,578 in FY 2013.
- 18. There is an estimated cost of \$30,000 per year for national agricultural imagery to handle the additional requirements on agricultural appraisal in HB 673.
- 19. Section 5 of HB663 requires the department to provide the Revenue and Transportation Interim Committee with a sales assessment ratio study of residences. The estimated cost is \$75,000 in FY 2011 and in FY 2013.
- 20. Section 9 of HB663 would create a forest advisory council and maintains the agricultural land advisory council. The estimated cost associated with staffing these councils is \$36,800 in FY 2012.
- 21. An educational/informational taxpayer program is estimated at \$46,000 for FY 2010, FY 2011 and for FY 2012. Additional expenses for an advertising campaign include \$4,047 each year in FY 2010 through FY 2012 and \$60,000 in FY 2013.

HB 663: Department of Revenue Administrative Costs
Property Assessment Division

	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
Total FTE	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Total Personnel Services	\$239,736	\$239,736	\$239,736	\$239,736
Total Annual Operating Costs	\$36,480	\$38,480	\$38,480	\$38,480
Total Equipment	\$25,150	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Other Costs- PAD	\$210,012	\$286,278	\$212,122	\$298,293
Total Administrative Costs	\$511,378	\$564,494	\$490,338	\$576,509

Office of Public Instruction

- 22. The change in taxable value from present law to HB 673 would create a GTB cost to the state general fund of \$0.7 million in FY 2010, \$4.4 million in FY 2011, \$3.6 million in FY 2012 and \$3.9 million in FY 2013.
- 23. County school levies for all district funds will not change the amount of revenue received due to this bill as local school district mills float to adjust. The amount each taxpayer will pay will change based on the assessed value of their property.

24. Countywide retirement GTB will decrease due to the increase in taxable values by approximately \$3,646 in FY 2010, \$1.2 million in FY 2011, and \$1.0 million in subsequent years. This is based on a historical average of 28% of the costs paid by the state and FY 2009 county levies of \$65.1 million.

	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Increase in Taxable Value	-0.02%	-7.04%	-5.54%	-5.54%
FY 2009 County Levies	\$65,100,000	\$65,100,000	\$65,100,000	\$65,100,000
State Share	28%	28%	28%	28%
County Retirement	(\$3,646)	(\$1,283,251)	(\$1,009,831)	(\$1,009,831)

- 25. Revenue received from county school levies for all district funds will not change due to this bill. Local school district mills would adjust to provide the needed revenue. The amount each taxpayer pays will change based on property tax value changes.
- 26. The GTB savings to the state general fund from HJR 2 to present law is \$2.0 million in FY 2010 and about \$2.5 million in subsequent years.

Error! Objects cannot be created from editing field codes.

Expenditure	and Revenue Impa	ct Relative to HJR	2	
	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
Fiscal Impact:	Difference	Difference	Difference	Difference
Department of Revenue				
FTE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Expenditures:				
Personal Services	\$239,736	\$239,736	\$239,736	\$239,736
Operating Expenses	\$36,480	\$36,480	\$36,480	\$36,480
Other Costs - Property Assessment Div.	\$210,012	\$286,278	\$212,122	\$298,293
Equipment	\$25,150	\$222,331	\$221,740	\$221,898
TOTAL Expenditures	\$511,378	\$784,825	\$710,078	\$796,407
Office of Public Instruction				
Expenditures:				
Local Assitance: GTB	(\$1,310,541)	\$1,793,067	\$1,064,458	\$1,363,599
Local Assistance: Co. Retire. (GTB)	(\$710,892)	\$328,140	\$116,659	\$136,710
TOTAL Expenditures	(\$2,021,433)	\$2,121,207	\$1,181,117	\$1,500,309
Funding of Expenditures (all agencies):				
General Fund (01)	(\$1,510,055)	\$2,906,032	\$1,891,195	\$2,296,716
Revenue				
Tax Credits (01)	(\$1,845,000)	(\$2,156,000)	(\$2,406,000)	(\$2,693,000)
General Fund Property Tax Mitigation	(\$9,781,840)	(\$24,830,171)	(\$40,445,451)	(\$56,569,658)
Extended Property Tax Assistance (01)	(\$325,236)	(\$435,799)	(\$215,767)	(\$131,918)
Total General Fund Revenue	(\$11,952,076)	(\$27,421,970)	(\$43,067,218)	(\$59,394,576)
SSR (6 mill) Property Tax Mitigation	(\$614,373)	(\$1,559,521)	(\$2,540,277)	(\$3,552,999)
Extended Property Tax Assistance (02)	(\$20,541)	(\$27,524)	(\$13,627)	(\$68,332)
Total State Special Revenue	(\$229,350)	(\$229,350)	(\$229,350)	(\$229,350)
TOTAL Revenues	(\$12,181,426)	(\$120,071,717)	(\$134,476,430)	(\$147,889,214)
Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Fu	nding of Expenditu	res):		
General Fund (01)	(\$10,442,021)	(\$30,328,002)	(\$44,958,413)	(\$61,691,292)
State Special Revenue (02)	(\$229,350)	(\$229,350)	(\$229,350)	(\$229,350)

Effect on County or Other Local Revenues or Expenditures:

1. Using the difference in taxable value under HB 663 and projected statewide average local mills under the bill and under current law it is estimated that with respect current law there would be a reduction in local jurisdiction total property tax revenue of \$13.2 million lower in FY 2010, \$1.7 million higher in FY 2011, \$5.1 million higher FY 2012 and \$12.0 million higher in FY 2013. It is anticipated that local and school mills would adjust. Relative to HJ 2 taxable value and mill estimates The local jurisdictions would collect more \$43.5 million in FY 2010. There would be a reduction in local jurisdiction total property tax revenue of \$57.3 million in FY 2011, \$81.2 million in FY 2012, and \$102.8 million in FY 2013.

Technical Notes:

Department of Revenue

1. The purpose of the forestland advisory council established in this bill would be to review the calculations involved in forest land valuation, but under the current language the council would not review the net

Fiscal Note Request – As Introduced

(continued)

income calculations, nor the capitalization rate. If that is not the intent an amendment should include subsections (5) and (6) in (10)(c)(i).

2.	The terms of the members of the forestland advisory council could become problematic since the current
	language has those terms expiring on December 31 of each even numbered year. That will result in overlap
	of committees during each 4-year reappraisal cycle. It would be more workable if the term of the committee
	was similar to the Agricultural Land Valuation Advisory Committee

Sponsor's Initials

Date

Budget Director's Initials

Date